



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/672,343	09/25/2003	Kazuya Kitamura	(70868) 59976	9693
21874	7590	04/18/2005	EXAMINER	
EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP P.O. BOX 55874 BOSTON, MA 02205			DANG, HUNG XUAN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2873	

DATE MAILED: 04/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/672,343

Applicant(s)

KITAMURA ET AL.

Examiner

Hung X. Dang

Art Unit

2873

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 January 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-7,9,10,12,14 and 15 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 8, 11 and 13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Applicant's election without traverse of species (1) claims 8, 11 and 13 of Group II in the reply filed on 1/13/05 is acknowledged.

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The Information disclosure Statements filed on 1/5/04 has been considered.

It is noted that the Japanese patents have been considered to the best of the ability of the examiner without benefit of translation.

Claims Rejection Under 35 USC - 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by **Rekow** (6,773,142).

Rekow discloses apparatus for projecting line of light from a diode-laser array comprises a first microlens thickness direction; and a second microlens array disposed to another end face in the thickness direction and formed into a cylindrical shape array disposed to one end face in a (see figures 5B, 6 and the related disclosure).

Claims Rejection Under 35 USC - 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 8, 11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Tanaka et al** (5,633,737) in view of **Rekow** (6,773,142).

Tanaka et al discloses projection-type color liquid crystal display having two microlens array comprises a first microlens 5 thickness direction; and a second microlens array 6 disposed to another end face in the thickness direction and disposed to one end face in a (see figures 1B, 2, and the related disclosure).

Tanaka et al does not discloses that the microlens array form cylindrical shape.

Rekow, however, discloses the microlens array form cylindrical shape.

Because Tanaka et al and Rekow are both from the same field of endeavor, the purpose of providing a uniform intensity of light along the line of line as disclosed by Rekow would have been recognized as an art pertinent art of Tanaka et al.

It would have been obvious, therefore, at the time the invention was made to a person having skill in the art to construct the eyeglasses frame, such as the one disclosed by Tanaka et al, with the microlens form cylindrical shape, such as disclosed

Art Unit: 2873

by Rekow for the purpose of providing a uniform intensity of light along the line of line.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Examiner Dang at telephone number (571) 272-2326.

4/05


HUNG DANG

PRIMARY EXAMINER

TC 2800